

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 24-36 have been newly canceled. Claims 3, 4 and 37 have been amended to be in independent form. New claims 38-44, dependent on independent claim 3, have been added. Claims 3, 4, 6-17, and 37-44 are pending. This application now has three independent claims and 22 total claims. No fee for extra claims is required.

Also the specification has been amended to insert omitted reference numerals 31 and 41, seen in Figure 2A. Item 31 in Figure 2A is the local clock that provides a current time to the imaging system, whereas 41 in Figure 2A is the local clock that provides a current time to the hemodynamic system.

In the office action, claims 1-17, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant traverses this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner has asserted only that claims 1 and 36 are non-statutory. Claims 2-17 and 37 were rejected because they depended from claims 1 and 36. The Applicant respectfully submits that this ground of rejection has been overcome by the cancellation of claims 1 and 36. The Examiner nowhere asserts that the subject matter recited in the dependent claims is non-statutory.

In any event, claims 3, 4 and 37 have been amended in independent form to recite statutory subject matter. Each independent claim recites a method that produces a useful,

concrete and tangible result. In particular, the useful, concrete and tangible result produced by the method of claim 3 is concurrent display of an acquired frame of imaging data and acquired physiologic data corresponding to a predetermined cardiac event; the useful, concrete and tangible result produced by the method of claim 4 is the ability to compute which frame was acquired in substantial synchronism with a first predetermined cardiac event and then perform quantitative coronary analysis based at least in part on that acquired frame; and the useful, concrete and tangible result produced by the method of claim 37 is the ability to select a frame of imaging data acquired at a time substantially synchronized with a predetermined cardiac event recorded in the acquired physiologic data and then perform quantitative analysis based at least in part on said selected frame of imaging data. Accordingly, it is believed that the Section 101 rejection has been overcome.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-17, 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Applicant traverses this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

In support of the indefiniteness rejection, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how to automatically time stamp each acquired frame with respective times generated by a first clock. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The specification states that "each frame of imaging data acquired by the x-ray imager 30 is time stamped with the local time with

reference to a first local clock 31 located in or connected to the x-ray imager 30." [0025] This is a very simple process. It is well known by any person skilled in the art of operating an imaging machine that a frame of imaging data is acquired in response to the machine operator pressing a button or activating some other input device. When the image acquisition button is pressed, the current time being output by local clock 31 is stored in association with the acquired frame. "Each frame is later encapsulated in a DICOM object, with the associated time stamp for that frame being inserted in a predetermined field in a header in the DICOM object." [0025] Accordingly, there is ample support in the specification and the claim limitation "automatically time stamping" is not in any sense indefinite.

The Examiner further objected to the recitation in the claims of the step of automatically calculating respective offsets of the local clock relative to a reference clock for each time stamp. The details of this process are disclosed in paragraph [0030] of the specification. Again there is no indefiniteness in the claim language when viewed in light of the supporting portions in the specification.


Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the indefiniteness rejection is mistaken and should be withdrawn.

Atty Docket: 31-CD-5526

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 3, 4, 6-17, and 37-44 are hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

February 19, 2007  
Date

  
Dennis M. Flaherty  
Reg. No. 31,159  
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &  
Broitman P.C.  
250 Park Avenue, Suite 825  
New York, NY 10177-0899  
Tel. No.: 212-826-6565

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

February 19, 2007  
Date

  
Dennis M. Flaherty